

Don Springmeyer, Esq. (NBN 1021)  
KEMP JONES, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Tel: (702) 385-6000  
Email: d.springmeyer@kempjones.com

Miles N. Clark, Esq. (NBN 13848)  
LAW OFFICES OF MILES N. CLARK, LLC  
5510 S. Fort Apache Rd., Suite 30  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89148-7700  
Tel: (702) 856-7430  
Email: miles@milesclarklaw.com

*Co-Liasion Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*

*(Additional Counsel on Signature Page)*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

In re: MGM Resorts International Data Breach  
Litigation

Master File No.: 2:20-cv-00376-GMN-NJK

**NOTICE OF RELATED CASES  
PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 42.1**

This Document Relates To: All actions.

**RELATED CASE NOS.:**  
**2:23-CV-01981-RFB-EJY**  
**2:23-CV-02042-ART-BNW**  
**2:23-CV-02064-APG-DJA**

Plaintiffs Ryan Bohlim, Duke Hwynn, Andrew Sedaghtpour, Gennady Simkin, Robert Taylor, Michael Fossett, Victor Wukovits, Kerri Shapiro, Julie Mutsko, John Dvorak, Larry Lawter, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated (collectively, "Plaintiffs") hereby file this Notice of Related Cases. This Notice supplements the Notice of Related Cases previously filed on December 6, 2023.

**I. Title and Case Number of Each Possibly Related Action:**

- *Albrigo v. MGM Resorts International*, 2:23-cv-01981-RFB-EJY, filed November 30, 2023
- *Sloan v. VICI Properties Inc., et al.*, No. 2:23-cv-02042-ART-BNW, filed December 9, 2023
- *Righetti v. MGM Resorts International*, No. 2:23-cv-02064-APG-DJA, filed December 14, 2023

1           **II.       These Cases Should Be Related to *In re: MGM Resorts International Data Breach***  
2                           ***Litigation.***

3           Together with the ten cases identified in the Notice filed on December 6, 2023, these three  
4 cases should also be related to the ongoing litigation captioned *In re: MGM Resorts International Data*  
5 *Breach Litigation*, No. 2:20-CV-00376-GMN-NJK (“*In re: MGM Data Breach*”) because they involve  
6 the same claims based on similar facts being alleged against the same Defendant on behalf of  
7 substantially overlapping putative classes. *See* Notice, *In re: MGM Data Breach*, Dkt. No. 183  
8 (December 6, 2023).

9           As detailed in the previously filed Notice, in 2020, Judge Navarro appointed the undersigned  
10 as Co-Lead Counsel and Co-Liasion Counsel in six consolidated class actions brought against MGM  
11 Resorts International by individuals whose information was compromised in MGM’s massive 2019  
12 data breach. *See* Order, *In re: MGM Data Breach*, Dkt. No. 93 (February 1, 2021). Since then, the  
13 parties have briefed MGM’s Motion to Dismiss, which the Court granted in part and denied in part in  
14 a detailed 43-page Order. *See Id.*, Dkt. No. 128 (Nov. 2, 2022). The parties are now in the middle of  
15 fact discovery and about to begin depositions.

16           Just like the cases identified in the previously filed Notice, these three cases assert similar  
17 claims against MGM related to a data breach that the company announced in September 2023. They  
18 involve the same defendant, substantially similar factual questions, and appear to involve a largely  
19 overlapping proposed classes as *In re: MGM Data Breach*. In particular, MGM notified many affected  
20 consumers that the personal information obtained in the 2023 breach belonged to customers who  
21 transacted with MGM prior to March 2019, which means the class members in the 2023 Data Breach  
22 Cases are substantially the same people whose claims already are being litigated in *In re: MGM Data*  
23 *Breach*. In addition, both the 2019 and 2023 data breaches resulted in the compromise of the same  
24 types of personal information. Thus, many of the legal and factual questions at issue in the cases are  
25 overlapping, such that assignment to a single district judge will promote judicial efficiency and prevent  
26 inconsistent results. The newly-filed cases assert the same or substantially similar claims against  
27 MGM as in the 2019 data breach case.

1           Assigning these cases to different judges also would risk inconsistent judgments. For example,  
2     in the present case, Judge Navarro has already ruled on issues like whether the economic loss doctrine  
3     bars Plaintiffs' negligence claim (finding that it does not) and whether Plaintiffs' damages theories  
4     concerning the benefit of the bargain and the diminution of value of PII are legally cognizable (finding  
5     in favor of Plaintiffs on both theories). *See Smallman v. MGM Resorts International*, 638 F. Supp. 3d  
6     1175, 1188, 1190-91 (D. Nev. 2022). Unsurprisingly, plaintiffs in the newly-filed cases also make  
7     negligence claims and assert damages theories that are very similar to those in *In re: MGM Data*  
8     *Breach*. There is, therefore, a significant risk of inefficient and inconsistent judgments should different  
9     judges be assigned and reach varying conclusions on the same issues in litigation involving the same  
10    Defendant.

11          MGM filed a document styled as a "Response" in opposition to Plaintiffs' Notice, but  
12    conspicuously did not respond to the argument that all of these actions involve substantially the same  
13    class members. *See Response, In re: MGM Data Breach*, Dkt. No. 184 (December 8, 2023). The *In*  
14    *re: MGM Data Breach* plaintiffs have served MGM with discovery concerning the overlap between  
15    the two data breaches and the affected class members and MGM has yet to provide any substantive  
16    response. While the undersigned are only moving to relate these cases at this time, it may, depending  
17    on the facts, be extraordinarily inefficient to appoint separate counsel to represent substantially the  
18    same class members on nearly identical legal and factual claims.

19          Given the similar questions of law and fact between those actions and this case, the strong  
20    likelihood of significant overlap between the class members, and the substantial progress in *In re:*  
21    *MGM Data Breach*, relating these actions would be far more efficient than keeping them separate.

22          DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2023.

23                               Respectfully submitted,

24                               KEMP JONES, LLP

25                               /s/ Don Springmeyer

26                               Don Springmeyer, Esq. (NBN 1021)

27                               3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17th Floor

28                               Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

1 Miles N. Clark, Esq. (NBN 13848)  
2 LAW OFFICES OF MILES N. CLARK, LLC  
3 5510 S. Fort Apache Rd., Suite 30  
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89148-7700

*Co-Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*

5 David M. Berger (*pro hac vice*)  
6 Eric H. Gibbs (*pro hac vice*)  
7 GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP  
8 1111 Broadway, Suite 2100  
9 Oakland, California 94607

10 Michael Dell'Angelo (*pro hac vice*)  
11 Reginald Streater (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
12 Mark DeSanto (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
13 BERGER MONTAGUE, PC  
14 1818 Market Street, Suite 3600  
15 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

16 Douglas J. McNamara (*pro hac vice*)  
17 Karina G. Puttieva (*pro hac vice*)  
18 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL, PLLC  
19 1100 New York Ave., 5th Floor  
20 Washington, D.C. 20005

21 Claire L. Torchiana (*pro hac vice*)  
22 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL, PLLC  
23 88 Pine Street, 14th Fl.  
24 New York, New York 10005

25 E. Michelle Drake (*pro hac vice*)  
26 BERGER MONTAGUE, PC  
27 1229 Tyler Street NE, Suite 205  
28 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)  
Jean S. Martin (*pro hac vice*)  
Marcio Valladares (*pro hac vice*)  
MORGAN & MORGAN  
COMPLEX LITIGATION GROUP  
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
Tampa, Florida 33602

*Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2023, and pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NOTICE OF RELATED CASES PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 42.1** was served via the U.S. District Court's electronic filing system on all individuals entitled to receive service thereto.

/s/ Pamela McAfee  
An employee of Kemp Jones, LLP